**IN THE HIGH COURT OF HIMACHAL PRADESH,
SHIMLA**

**CWP No. 16614/2024
Decided on: 31.12.2024**

Rakesh Sharma …Petitioner

Versus

State of H.P. & Anr.

….Respondents.

……

Coram
Ms. Justice Jyotsna Rewal Dua, Judge.

Whether approved for reporting?[1]

For the petitioner: **Mr. Piyush Mehta, Advocate.**

For the respondents: **Ms. Leena Guleria, Deputy Advocate General.**

***Jyotsna Rewal Dua*, J**

Notice. Ms. Leena Guleria, learned Deputy Advocate General, accepts notice on behalf of the respondents.

2. This writ petition has been filed for the grant of following substantive reliefs:-

> *" (i) That the Hon'ble Court may be pleased to issue the Writ in the nature of mandamus directing the respondents to count the contractual services for the purpose of Annual Increments alongwith other consequential arrears.*
> *(ii) The respondents may be further directed to re-fix the pay of th petitioner after granting the annual increments for the services rendered on the contract basis followed by regularization."*

3. According to the petitioner, the legal issue involved in the case has already been adjudicated upon. The grievance of the

[1] *Whether reporters of the local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?*

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 03/11/2026 09:47:30 :::CIS

petitioner is that his representation dated 11.10.2024 (Annexure P-7) has still not been decided by the respondents/competent authority.

4. Once the legal principle involved in the adjudication of present petition has already been decided, it is expected from the welfare State to consider and decide the representation of the aggrieved employee within a reasonable time and not to sit over the same indefinitely compelling the employee to come to the Court for redresssal of his grievances. This is also the purport and object of the Litigation Policy of the State. Not taking decision on the representation for months together would not only give rise to unnecessary multiplication of the litigation but would also bring in otherwise avoidable increase to the Court docket on unproductive government induced litigation.

5. In view of above, the instant petition is disposed of by directing respondents/competent authority to consider and decide the aforesaid representation of the petitioner, in accordance with law within a period of six weeks from today. The order so passed be also communicated to the petitioner. Pending miscellaneous application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

Jyotsna Rewal Dua
Judge

31st December, 2024(rohit)

High Court of H.P.

::: Downloaded on - 03/11/2026 09:47:30 :::CIS